

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CEAYA L. THOMAS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 17-cv-13492
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

BANNUM PLACE OF SAGINAW, *et al.*,

(Consolidated with Case
No. 18-cv-10222)

Defendants.

**ORDER ON STATUS CONFERENCE AND
OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY ISSUES**

On June 6, 2019, the Court held an on-the-record status conference to discuss, among other things, outstanding discovery issues. For the reasons explained on the record, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. By not later than **July 8, 2019**, Defendant shall provide to all Plaintiffs a written report of the results the entire forensic examination ordered by Magistrate Judge Patti (*see* Case No. 17-cv-13492, ECF #41 at Pg. ID 623-24).

2. Plaintiffs may serve upon Defendant an interrogatory directing Defendant to identify the dates of all audits by the Bureau of Prisons for all facilities owned and/or operated by Defendant. The time frame for the audits that are the subject of this interrogatory is January 1, 2012, through the date that Plaintiff Thomas served her first set of interrogatories on Defendant. In this interrogatory,

Plaintiffs may also direct Defendant to identify the dates of operation for all of Defendant's facilities that were in operation at any time between January 1, 2012, and the date that Plaintiff Thomas served her first set of interrogatories on Defendant.

3. By not later than **July 8, 2019**, Defendant shall produce to all Plaintiffs all documents that Magistrate Judge Patti ordered produced in response to Request to Produce Number 16 of Plaintiff Thomas' first discovery requests (*see* Case No. 17-cv-13492, ECF #41 at Pg. ID 625), including but not limited to receipts and invoices.

4. By not later than **June 21, 2019**, Defendant shall serve upon all Plaintiffs signed answers (*see* Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(b)(3) & (b)(5)) to Plaintiff Thomas' Second Set of Interrogatories. It is the Court's understanding that Defendant has previously served objections to those interrogatories and to Plaintiff Thomas' Third Request for the Production of Documents. If those objections were timely served, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendant shall meet and confer to discuss the objections. Prior to the meet and confer, Plaintiffs shall set forth to Defendant in writing any arguments as to why the objections are not valid. If the meet and confer does not resolve the objections, Plaintiffs may file a motion to compel. If the Court determines that any unresolved objections by Defendant were not valid, the Court

will consider that determination as part of its consideration of any motion for entry of default judgment that Plaintiffs may file in the future.

5. Absent further order of the Court, Defendant shall make the following individuals available for deposition by all Plaintiffs in Florida during the week of June 24, 2019: John Rich, Sandra Allen, and Katrina Teel. To be clear, these witnesses shall be made available one time each for a deposition to be taken by all Plaintiffs in a single deposition.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 7, 2019

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 7, 2019, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda
Case Manager
(810) 341-9764